

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

9th Meeting, Thursday, 20 August 1953 at 4:00 P.M.  
DCI's Conference Room, Administration Building

Present

Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick  
Chairman

Colonel Lawrence K. White

Mr. Richard Helms

Mr. Huntington Sheldon

Mr. Lawrence R. Houston

25X1A9A

Colonel Matthew Baird

25X1A9A

Mr. John S. Warner

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
CLASSIFICATION \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTHORITY \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_ REVIEWER: \_\_\_\_\_

02011

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

RB

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Ninth Meeting, CIA Career Service Board, 20 August 1953  
at 4:00 P.M.

1. Minutes of the 8th meeting of the CIA Career Service Board, held 2 July 1953, were approved without change.
2. Memorandum for the Record "Meetings of the Steering Group of the CIA Career Service Board," dated 17 August 1953, were approved, except that paragraph 3 of the record of the meeting on 10 August 1953 is amended to delete reference to Junior Officer Trainees.
3. The decisions of the Steering Group on 10 August 1953 with respect to the Professional Selection Panel's proposed selection procedure were approved.
4. The Board delegated to its Steering Group the Board's authority with respect to proposed honor awards, but recommended also that consideration be given to the development of a flow sheet or routing sheet which would transmit such papers to individual Board members for comment.
5. The Chairman reported that the number of Career Development Slots has been reduced from fifty to forty, and that remaining problems with respect to the assignment and use of these slots are matters for administrative resolution.

25X1A6A

7. The Board reviewed the memorandum "Preliminary Report of the Legislative Task Force," dated 13 August 1953. The following conclusions were reached:

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

a. If the establishment of the Agency's career service requires legislation, such legislation should be proposed in a single package.

b. Extreme care must be taken to avoid legislation which would unnecessarily restrict or handicap the Agency in the accomplishment of its mission.

c. Before reaching any final decisions with respect to the proposals for legislation, each item of the policy must be carefully studied by the General Counsel, Personnel Office, Security Office, Comptroller, and other Offices as indicated.

d. Paragraph 2 of the memorandum of the Chairman, Legislative Task Force, may contain information of value to the Information Task Force.

e. Paragraph 3 of the above cited memorandum should be revised to indicate that both statutory and administrative actions are required by the career program.

h. Tab A - returned to Task Force for more considerations.  
Coverage for TDY employees overseas is desired, however accomplished.

g. Tab B - concur in recommendations.

h. Tab C - concur in recommendations.

i. Tab D - concur in desirability of death gratuity, but believe that a standard lump sum payment (not related to salary) is preferable.

CONFIDENTIAL

- j. Tab E - keep the Civil Service retirement system, but give consideration to possibility of retirement at an earlier age.
- k. Tab F - try for the leave system of the Foreign Service.
- l. Tab G - concur generally in recommendations.
- m. Tab I - retain the present pay scales and have classification be a matter of administrative determination within CIA.
- n. Tab K - concur in recommendations.
- o. Tab L - concur in recommendations.
- p. Tab M - concur in recommendations.
- q. Tab N - do not concur in recommendations.
- r. Tab O - concur in internal procedures, but major questions on outside review board.
- s. Tab P - no outside review on appeals desired.
- t. Tab S - in terms of legislation, no more than a statement that the Director may establish such a reserve as is considered desirable.
- u. Tab T - the type of material to be presented only if necessary to obtain legislation (Special Note #1 approved, #2 disapproved, #3 approved, #4 to be re-examined).
- v. Tab U - no legislation, but some form of aid society or foundation.
- w. Tab W - a single intelligence service established by legislation if necessary, do not concur in paragraphs 3 and 4, paragraphs 5 and 6 are not the concern of the Task Force, no inspection from outside.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

## CONFIDENTIAL

CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>		<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		Approval of Minutes	1
2		Professional Selection Panel	1
3		Recommendations re Honor Awards	1 - 2
4		Career Development Slots	2 - 3
5			3 - 5
6		General discussion of a Career Service and its legislative requirements	5 - 12
7	A	"Medical Care for Headquarters Personnel"	12 - 17
8	B	"Missing Persons Act"	17 - 18
9	C	"Extension of US Employees Compensation Act to Dependents"	18 - 19
10	D	"Death Gratuity to Dependents"	19 - 20
11	E	"Liberalization of Retirement"	20 - 27
12	F	"Adequate Leave System"	27
13	G	"Educational Benefits for Dependents"	27 - 28
14	I	"Pay Scales and Classification"	28
15	L	"Personnel Evaluation"	29
16	M	"Hardship Posts"	29
17	N	"Twenty-four Hour Duty Concept"	30
18	O	"Tenure"	30 - 37
19	P	"Reduction in Force"	32 - 33
20	S	"CIA Reserve"	33 - 34
21	T	"Obligations"	34 - 37
22	U	"Relief from Personal Hardship"	37
23	W	"Organization and Structure"	37 - 38

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, should we come to order. We have a monumental task in front of us today, and if you want to get through it, I think we will have to move fairly rapidly. I doubt very much if we can cover the entire Legislative Task Force Report today, but we will take a shot at covering the best part of it. The first item on the formal agenda is the "Minutes of the 8th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board, held 2 July 1953" -- I am taking the first and third together -- and the minutes of the Steering Group which were sent to you. Does anybody have any changes or corrections they would like to make? Colonel Baird?

COLONEL BAIRD: Yes, sir, the meeting of the 10th of August, paragraph number 3, "The Chairman indicated a general concern with respect to the low morale evidenced by Junior Officers and Junior Officer Trainees and indicated that he may establish a panel of such officers to review the problems which contributed to their low morale." Is that an accurate statement of your . . . ?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would prefer to have that indicate by Junior Officers in the generic sense rather than the specific sense.

COLONEL BAIRD: I don't think it affects the Junior Officer Trainees.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think it does either. I corrected that with

25X1A9A

☐ later. So if the permanent minutes would be changed to reflect that, Rud.

25X1A9A

☐ Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other corrections or changes of the minutes?

(None indicated)

2 The other items on the formal agenda concern the Professional Selection Panel. Does anybody wish to make any changes in those? You will recall they were discussed before formally, and it was generally agreed that the principles were acceptable as presented. If there are no loud noises, I will proceed then to new business.

3 We are starting to receive from outside agencies recommendations for honors awards in this Intelligence Medal which the Director can award, plus

CONFIDENTIAL

the fact that there are honor awards going in for our own people. In order that these can be handled expeditiously, I would like to recommend to the Board that they authorize the Steering Group as such to be able to pass on the recommendations of the Honors Awards Board rather than hold these recommendations up for a full month till the next meeting of the CIA Board, if that is acceptable, inasmuch as the Steering Group generally speaking has had at least three or four members from the Board at each meeting, I think this is acceptable procedure if the Board is willing.

MR. HELMS: Who is giving out all of these medals?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We have not given one yet, but there are three in the mill, I understand. There is one, an Army recommendation for the National Medal, which has just come in and gone to the Board, and there are <sup>Security</sup> ~~three~~ <sup>two</sup> military decorations before the Board for our people, and it is just my thought that if the Board were willing to accept the recommendations of the Steering Group as being the recommendations of this Board that we could handle them pretty fast. Are there any dissenters?

25X1A9A GENERAL  An alternative would be to put them out on vote sheet.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That could be done, General, but I think on these we will want to hear somebody make a presentation before the Board.

25X1A9A  Not fully documented?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, they are fully documented, yes.

COLONEL BAIRD: It means more paper work.

25X1A9A MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we leave <sup>it that</sup> we can handle it either way?

Let's take a look at it in the Steering Group and see if we can't save time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is a tempest somewhere in the teapot here on career development slots, but one thing which you should know, and I think most of you know already, is that there are 40 career development slots instead of 50. The economy move of the Government has had its effect on career development too, and I believe <sup>in view</sup> of the fact that only 17 of those are allocated, there is no tight pinch there, the point being, however,

4 that seems to be at issue, and which I don't think is a very serious matter, is where the bodies and career development slots are assigned during their career development. I think that is an administrative matter unless the Board feels there is a major issue involved. If that is the case we will then proceed to the Legislative Task Force program.

5 It just happened coincidentally that there arrived in my office today a document from the Senior Representative [redacted], and he makes some very interesting comments which I thought I would pass on to you very briefly on the [redacted] Career program. I will try and make them pertinent to this legislative program. Colonel Baird will be interested to know that they also use spotters in universities and schools, an almost identical system with what we have. If the candidate is acceptable, that is, after looking over his security, he appears before a board of staff members of three to six individuals, all of whom are considered as senior officers. When he enters on duty, that is, if he is accepted by this board, he is given a detailed outline of what his career will be like in the service, that is, inasmuch as they can do it. The probationary period is three years during which time -- well, this doesn't affect the entire Agency -- but during that time they expect him to be overseas at least half of that period. At the end of the probationary period the individual is examined by the Personnel Board again and is then promoted to the permanent category, in other words, he is promoted into the Career Service, and as was pointed out in part of this program, that was quite an event in his life.

25X1A6A

25X1X7

They have a system there incidentally of an annual raise, sort of like our in-grade promotions, and then there is the next step in the career, to become a senior officer. Incidentally, before the annual raise is given the Personnel Board reviews the evaluations of the individual, and there is a definite program that at least once a year the individual is informed of his supervisors and the evaluation of his work. Selection for senior positions is also done by the Personnel Board. Their allowances, which is pertinent to this Legislative Task Force Report, are identical to those



of their Foreign Office. In other words, it would be similar to our conformance to the Department of State, They do, however, pay for the education of their members' children while overseas, and an interesting comment which is that apparently their overseas posts have what they call a morale fund. They have a regular training program. I would imagine it is quite similar to ours, and some of their personnel are sent to external schooling at the expense of their Agency. They also go in for language training in the area, and there is a definite feeling apparently that their retirement benefits are too low, and they would like to increase them, but once again they seem to be tied in there with their Foreign Service.

The statement is made, which I think is rather interesting, that the sums received by a retiring officer of [ ] today are in most instances inadequate to retain a reasonable standard of living. It has been my impression that most [ ] salaries are the same.

25X1X7

25X1X7

25X1A9A [ ] That is true of the military too. Does it say how they eliminate them?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Elimination apparently is almost exclusively in that early probationary period, and there doesn't seem to be much evidence of elimination after that. Once they have been selected why they are in. They do make one interesting comment, and that is they think the life value of an officer is about 15 years of service, but I think that is primarily a cover proposition. Don't you think that after 15 years they go on liaison jobs?

MR. HELMS: Except for a few old hands they haven't had most of their group 15 years as it is.

COLONEL BAIRD: They take administrative jobs after 15 years.

MR. HELMS: There are a handful of them that have been there a long time.

[ ] Most of them are since the beginning of the war.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: He goes into this to a certain degree, that they are facing a serious problem there of having their age groups bracketed, that they have a lot of World War II men in their 30's now, and that in 10 years they are going to have a bunch of old ones and a bunch of young ones and no group coming through the middle grade. - 4 -

25X1A9A

COLONEL BAIRD: Dick, do you know, or did [ ] say anything about numbers annually coming in?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, there is no mention of numbers here; this is all very general.

MR. HELMS: You won't be able to get ahold of that either.

COLONEL BAIRD: I knew it wouldn't be given, but I thought you might have it. I would bet it is 1/50 of ours.

MR. HELMS: It is a very much smaller organization, very much smaller.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: On the basis of reading this, it is interesting to me to note that they seem to be in exactly the same stage we are in development of a career service, something that I thought would have been done in the days of [ ].

25X1X7

MR. HOUSTON: Kirk, also under their system they have to worry less about legislative authority, I believe.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, we have talked about that a little, and they have what has been proposed for us actually. They have a group in the [ ] that that man confers with, and it just disappears from there.

25X1X7

MR. HOUSTON: That is what I mean. Their system permits that, and I doubt if ours will come quite to that point.

MR. HELMS: Have you talked to [ ] at all because he apparently sat on that Selection Board during his last term and knows a good deal about this whole process.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I thought I would get to talk with him over lunch.

MR. HELMS: I imagine you can get a lot out of him.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, shall we turn to the report of the Legislative Task Force. I think to commence with I should thank this group for doing what I think is a superb job. It is in a very concise form, <sup>with</sup> the major items to be considered in looking at the possibility of a legislative program. I think today and at subsequent meetings, if necessary, what we should endeavor to do is to go over this program item by item and see how the Board as representative of the entire Agency feel<sup>s</sup> as to the necessity

of particular parts of the program directed towards the end result of making a determination of <sup>what</sup> ~~whether~~ it is the consensus <sup>of the Board</sup> ~~of the Board~~ and <sup>whether the Board</sup> ~~is~~ prepared to ~~recommend~~ recommend to the Director that we should go after legislation. I think it is my feeling to start with that if we want legislation we ought to put it in a package and go after one bill which would give us what we need.

We have one word of admonition from General Cabell. I mentioned the legislative program to him at the Directors' Meeting yesterday, and he said that we <sup>should</sup> ~~would~~ not present it to him <sup>to</sup> ~~or~~ the Director until the Career Service Board had made a determination, ~~and~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ only comment was to the effect that in studying and in looking at legislation, <sup>we should</sup> ~~make~~ sure that <sup>we</sup> ~~you~~ do not do what the military services have done, and that is <sup>to</sup> ~~shackle~~ themselves by their legislation so that they are hampered as much as they are helped, and they find it actually a burden in many respects as well as a benefit.

So with that brief start let's start right in and go through this page by page. I think I might just comment for the general edification of the group that paragraph 3 seems to have aroused some <sup>hackles</sup> ~~hackles~~, Mr. Houston coming in with blood in his eyes saying that he didn't agree with it in any sense of the word, but I think it is a matter of interpretation rather than principle. Are there any comments on the first page?

COLONEL BAIRD: I would be interested to hear . . .

COLONEL WHITE: Could I make a general comment?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Red.

COLONEL WHITE: I got this package, which is relatively concise, two days ago, and I have been able to spend about 2-1/2 hours on it up to now, and there is an awful lot in it, and it is a swell job. A lot of it, of course, is controversial. And while the DD/A's Office in the form of John Warner worked on this, my specific request to him was that he not

let anything that I might ~~not~~ think or any other office might think influence what he did. This was a Task Force, and he was working for you, and I would just like to say that there are a lot of controversial things in here which I feel before final decision as to what we are going to do is made need to be studied more carefully by the General Counsel, Personnel Office, possibly Security and the Comptroller, and while I think we can do a great deal toward discussing them here from the administrative point of view, I think we would like to dig into these things a lot deeper than I have had a chance to do so far; that is, before we say that this is what we think the Agency ought to do, we need a lot of advice on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is perfectly acceptable, Red. Well, if we can get through part of this today, we might want the rest of it later, and in the meantime those four offices can be getting together their comments.

MR. HOUSTON: I would like to say just a word on my thoughts on paragraph 3.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me say a word about paragraph 2. It seems to me the statement there beginning "The career service is a group of dedicated people . . ." is a very good item for the Writing Task Force to pick up and utilize in their pamphlet of What a Career in CIA Service Means.

MR. HOUSTON: The first two sentences of paragraph 3 I do not agree with, that it is essential that we found it on statute and that a program based solely on administrative action is no program at all. You can have all the statutes in the world and have a rotten career service, and it is possible to establish a career service without statute. I think I consider legislation primarily a tool to bolster and give the necessary support to a career service, and there are several provisions in here which go to the establishment of the term Career Service by statute that I would not go along with as separate items.

I agree with Kirk that if we are going to get a general package, including all the tools, then it may be well to spell out in the statute the thought and principle of a Career Service, but I think that is quite a different thought from that contained in these first two sentences. I feel quite strongly on the matter.

MR. SHELDON: Could we hear from others of the Task Force who took either similar positions or opposed positions so that we can get some kind of an idea of how the general feeling is on this?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: John, do you want to speak to that?

MR. WARNER: Yes, first of all I think it is most unfortunate it is phrased this way, however, it probably serves a good purpose in focusing the issue and raising the points. As you will note, it is in the majority, so there were some differences of opinion. I think possibly it would be a little more accurate to almost have phrased it the way Larry has done.

MR. HOUSTON: I think by discussion since then most people say that this is not precisely what they intended to say.

MR. WARNER: That is right, and if you must remember, this was assembled in two weeks, and what we tried to do is raise as many points substantively here, and possibly this descriptive terminology here is not as good as it could be on a final draft. We do feel -- or at least I feel -- I won't speak for we -- that legislation is desirable, highly desirable, in terms of establishing the concept of this career service, that in government we look at examples, and there is no career service that doesn't have a statute behind it, <sup>Even</sup> the Civil Service which is a career service <sup>is</sup> based on statute. Now granted you don't have to have it in order to hire people, and administratively you get your program together, but experience has shown that both the tools with which to run a career service and the concept are greatly aided by statute.

I would like further to address myself, as long as I have the floor, to the point that Red brought up, and I think our concluding paragraph covers it. We too believe this is a complex subject; however, we hope to get out

of this kind of discussion some sort of guidance and thinking as to which way we generally lean so that this group of itself can go back and make some more studies in order that we can then make some more intelligent decisions, but we don't believe we should go off in the corner and spend a couple of man years drawing up a staff study on a particular subject if this whole group feels it is ridiculous. Therefore, we do believe that these must be studied very carefully because some of the things that we very lightly and apparently brushed through here are actually very complex subjects -- the question of medical benefits for both employees and the dependents. There are many points involved here that are not touched upon and, therefore, if once we get some general approach by this group, we hope to come back with more detail, and even then would have to get a detailed going over by the appropriate elements.

May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Surely.

25X1A9A

Do I understand the purpose of establishing a career service with these limitations -- I get a sense of something rather rigid -- is it your belief that this will attract better people to the Agency?

MR. WARNER: I think that is the sole purpose of this, to attract better people and have a better performing Agency.

25X1A9A

There is some question in my mind as to whether the best people are attracted to career service that has all of the limitations and regulations attached to it, like the Foreign Service and the Military. It seems to me that any movement in the direction of a rigid organization will tend in the long run to fail to attract the best people and will fail to keep them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask you a question. When you say rigid organization aren't you still thinking in the era when CIA was an expanding organization with a great deal of flexibility and perhaps not looking at the fact that today we are a rigid organization and getting more and more rigid as the day goes by because the effect of this stop in growth which

has been directed is going to be that you are going to find promotions coming to a very very grinding halt because the top grades are going to be filled, and you can't promote other people into them. You find that you aren't getting the new blood flowing in at the rate we have in the past and find too you have all of that rigidity without any of the flexibility because you don't have a program.

I am not saying certain things couldn't be done and shouldn't be done, but I am wondering whether or not the things that need to be done can't be done simply within the Agency without all of the rather ominous sound of legislation, legislative action, and all of that kind of thing.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I certainly think there is nobody at this table who wouldn't agree that if we can get working a career service without legislation it is preferable because getting legislation is not going to be an easy job.

COLONEL BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, am I right in understanding that part of this study which doesn't appear here made provision for the hiring and employing of certain categories of personnel that need not be members of career service?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't believe there is any part of the study that doesn't appear here.

COLONEL BAIRD: But that is part of another study then that the Personnel Office has made.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It is news to me.

I think, Matt, there is provision for the Agency to have temporary employees today.

25X1A9A

COLONEL BAIRD: I was thinking of scientists, etc., who come on for a period of two years and then turn to their university or organization, and they are employed by the Agency with full rights and benefits but would not be necessarily members of the career service.

MR. WARNER: This doesn't intend or say it denies that, Matt.

25X1A9A

25X1 [ ] That isn't a study, Matt. It has already been studied and is in Regulation [ ] It is established -- an established regulation.

COLONEL WHITE: Category of employees.

[ ] That is right.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would anybody like to make a statement of the philosophy, etc., behind their thoughts in this in answer to Mr. Sheldon's question?

25X1A9A

6 [ ] I believe I would like to make a comment there, Mr. Chairman. As John has said, we approached this problem as open minded as possible, and to get down on paper practically everything which would have to be considered, and from my own point of view some of the things in the program were accepted as points of discussion, as important points, on which the decision had to be reached, and I would like to second our Chairman also in the hope that we should get from this Board the guidance needed because we found that there were certain basic things where there were differences among us, and we couldn't be sure in which direction the areas we represented wanted us to go and in which direction the Career Service Board thought we should go, so an effort was made to try to get down on paper as much of our thoughts and as much of our ideas, and in many cases there are things to which various ones of us took reservation at the time, but we thought that they merited very careful discussion. On the report itself I believe that the last one of the tabs and the statement there on the "W" on the question of organization is possibly, oh, I wouldn't say the most vital, but it is at least a vital part of it, and in my own mind at least the necessity for guidance on that portion is even greater than the guidance on the others, and the decision reached on that portion which is presented in "W" will more or less vitally affect the rest of the program, and in the problem that Colonel ~~XXXXX~~ Baird raised, that Tab "W" does mention several possibilities for various types of career service in the Agency.



MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, I would suggest that we proceed, and inas-  
much as the covering sheet -- covering memo -- is in effect a summary of  
the tabs, perhaps the best method unless somebody wants to comment on the  
covering memo is to start with the tabs and just run right through from A  
to W. Does anybody have any comments they want to make on the covering memo?

MR. SHELDON: I would like to ask one question if I may. Is there  
some way whereby we could tabulate the broad general objectives with an  
analysis against those as to whether legislation was required to achieve  
them or not? It seemed to me --

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That was done initially in the direction to the  
Task Force. I believe we could give you a copy of that.

MR. SHELDON: That would clarify in my mind as to whether the main  
question, whether legislation is necessary or not, which I assume is before  
the Board, is valid or not valid.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we get a copy of that to you? Would you  
do that, Rud?

☐ Yes.

25X1A9A

MR. WARNER: Kirk, wouldn't it be appropriate to say -- really the  
over-all objective we tried to state it -- the final objective is this  
concept of what is a career service? I think that is the objective. And  
what you need to attain it is what we want to discuss, and these points  
here I think through the first 16 to 17 tabs were those that were given  
to this group to consider, and we threw in a few more.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think there is no question that this Board  
as a group has decided that we want a career service, but what this exercise  
will indicate is what the views are of the Board as to the items that should  
go to make up the benefits in a career service, and then the decision will  
have to be made as to whether we have to have legislation to get those  
items or not.

Tab A is "Discussion of Medical Care for Headquarters Personnel being  
Made Comparable to that Available for Overseas Personnel in Certain Fields

and under Controlled Circumstances." Just to lead off I will state that I agree with the recommendations made here, that I do not believe that it would be advisable or proper to ask for legislation to extend the provisions of medical care to headquarters personnel inasmuch as we cannot distinguish ourselves from the rest of the government in Washington to that degree, and I don't think the Congress would even stand for it. I think there is a valid suggestion here that headquarters personnel on TDY overseas we might get provisions for.

COLONEL WHITE: We have had some experience with the TDY people. A man goes over on a trip, and sometimes his mission while he is there even though it is only a few days is just as hazardous -- sometimes a lot more so -- than the man who is stationed there permanently. We have had at least in one case that I remember very well where we couldn't pay a man's hospital bill merely because he was on temporary duty, and I am certainly sympathetic to that suggestion and also concur with your views on the headquarters personnel.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any dissenting views?





COLONEL WHITE: I was going to say that is my feeling. I think there is certainly enough evidence here to support further study of the problem.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think in throwing this back to the Task Force, Red, we can combine the two . . . Now is that acceptable?

(No expressed objections)

Then consider that thrown back at you.

MR. HOUSTON: There is another aspect of this in connection with those serving overseas where now the State Department has a more comprehensive program than do we based primarily on a policy interpretation. Correct me if I am wrong, John, but their policy is as soon as a person leaves on a foreign assignment he is considered on duty to the extent that any illness is considered in line of duty illness with rare exceptions such as due to his own negligence, etc. We have brought this up previously for policy ruling in this Agency, and that broadening of the line of duty concept was not approved.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: By whom?

MR. HOUSTON: General Smith, I believe.

MR. WARNER: No, it wasn't approved. It was before General Smith's time. I believe it was once again --

MR. HOUSTON: -- brought up again in General Smith's time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask you this. Is it legal?

MR. HOUSTON: We can do it if it is determined necessary.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me where we have a policy decision that can be made internally there.

MR. HOUSTON: In other words, the State Department is doing it with no more authority or less authority than we are and not . . . criticized yet. I think this brings up a reconsideration of that policy determination.

MR. WARNER: We didn't discuss that again carefully. I believe again if you just throw that back we could develop that a little more fully and present it again for final recommendation.

MR. HELMS: When some of these points came up, oh, I guess it was a

couple of years back when the Career Service Committee was first considering the Career Service Program, it struck me at the time that the discussion of any of these points immediately runs into the most technical possible field of what exists already, what we are permitted to do, what authorities we have, and what we don't have, etc., and I discovered I was most of the time at sea because I wasn't familiar with all of these laws, statutes, etc. And it seems to me this Board here at the moment is in the uncomfortable position of not knowing what it is talking about. We have certain aims and desires we would like to see fulfilled, but we don't have the technical equipment in our hands to make any rational decisions about it, and I was wondering if it might not be useful at this juncture if the Task Force were to take this whole paper one step further and that is to try and sort out some of these things and come up with very specific recommendations to us based on facts which can be adduced as to whether some of these things can be taken care of under existing legislation and those things which absolutely would need legislative support in order to accomplish them at all. In other words, to sort of cull out the wheat from the chaff here on this issue.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think they can, Dick, but I think this exercise this afternoon is necessary to give them the general idea of the Board's views as to what they want. If we can get through these tabs this afternoon, then they can go back and do that.

MR. HOUSTON: If you agree . . . and Personnel should substantially parallel those . . . joined by the Foreign Service, then we will work out how to get them.

MR. WARNER: That is exactly how we intended to do it. We didn't intend for you people at this meeting to go into all of the pros and cons and details, but if you think it is generally desirable, we will take this thing and then bring it back so you do have the pros, and cons, and laws, and technicalities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that most of these things were contracted to a hypothesis as to what the duties and

25X1A9A

obligations of a career employee are. Therefore, while this tab does not necessarily relate to duties, it relates to a foreign nation or area, and it does not relate to a kind of duty performed. If we got guidance as to the nature of the obligations of career service, what kind of things are people who are members are susceptible to, most of these other things would fall easily in order.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think I could answer that very simply. I think that the Agency expects of a career employee to answer any demand they might put on him for 24-hour duty a day to serve in any part of the world under any conditions to the best of his ability.

Then it follows, of course, that some of these medical benefits would have to be extended to persons while serving in the State of Virginia.

25X1A9A

MR. HOUSTON: No, it does not follow.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I wouldn't agree with you there. I think we have to recognize just out of practicality that we cannot in conditions of servitude which are similar to the balance of the government differentiate ourselves and get any legislation. We will never get it even with the President and 96 senators behind us. We will still be beaten in the House because we will never be able to explain enough about the Central Intelligence Agency under our security regulations to justify the fact we are peculiarly tabbed, and I think the thing we have to go out to get if we are going to get legislation is what we can practically obtain to give our people the benefits that they will have to have when we are asking them to either perform a service which is strenuous and exacting as in any part of the government. I think that is it in essence. Are there any other comments on Tab A? (No response)

Tab B is the Missing Persons Act. Any comment on that? My only comment is that if we are going to get legislation that this should be part of it, and if we are not going to get legislation, then obviously we should join

8  
with the balance of the government under the Missing Persons Act to get the benefits. Are there any other comments on B? (No comments)

Now Tab C.

MR. HOUSTON: I will go one step further on B that even if we can't get our career concept this is one provision we can justify and need badly even if we are <sup>6</sup>linked on most of the others.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes. Tab C concerns medical benefits for the dependents overseas. My comment on the recommendation is Yes.

25X1A9A

The recommendation, Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other comments on C. This incidentally I can speak to from the point of view of our hardship cases, and there are some distinct hardship cases that have come up where individuals serving in posts which to the best could be described as undesirable had injuries or illnesses to dependents which necessitated an expensive transportation cost to hospitals in the nearest major city, and something which unless the man had something in the bank account, he couldn't possibly have been taken care of under salaries.

9  
MR. HOUSTON: Two comments, Kirk. In our opinion this would require legislation and when sought as legislation will be highly controversial and will meet serious opposition.

25X1A9A

On the other hand this is one of the most difficult problems I have with about two-thirds of my command overseas.

MR. HOUSTON: I am not by those comments in any way recommending not going ahead for it. It is quite a tough one to handle.

25X1A9A

To get good people to go out to these places and stay when they do not have protection for their families makes it . . .

COLONEL BAIRD: Why is it?

MR. HOUSTON: It brings up the whole theory of socialized medicine. The Armed Services are under continual attack for their medical benefits. They are under continual attack and very strong attack.

9 L MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other comments on C? (No comments)

Tab D, the essence is that there should be an immediate death gratuity of from four to six months' salary for which legislation is obviously essential. What is the view on that?

MR. HOUSTON: There is one very interesting argument on this, I think, that I hadn't thought of until we discussed it today. In our death cases of people under any sort of cover an immediate security problem arises because the wives and families start asking questions as to where the money is, and if we can pay something and say, "Now let's sit tight and everything will be all right," then we have a much better position to keep the lid on.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Larry, can you give us any guidance as to how long it takes under the normal Act where, that is, the Civil Service, somebody dies in the Service before any payments take place?

MR. HOUSTON: We can get them out in three weeks, and at least I have been so assured by George Meloon, and that means you are just continuing your normal pay period overlap, but when you run into the cover positions, sometimes it has been months before we can arrange the whole story and method of payment, and we have had several cases --

25X1A9A

25X1A6A

10 [ ] We couldn't start settling that for a long time. And recent questions we have had.

COLONEL BAIRD: Larry, is that the reason for the monthly salary payments rather than the lump sum. It seems to me that when somebody who is a GS-5 dies his wife is going to have the same funeral cost, transportation of body, etc., as a GS-15's wife, but I suppose there is a reason for not being a lump sum being tied to the salary of the employee.

MR. HOUSTON: The only parallels we can find are tied to salary.

25X1A9A

[ ] Is this the equivalent of six months' salary in a lump sum, or is this six months' salary paid every two weeks?

MR. HOUSTON: Lump sum to tide them over.

COLONEL BAIRD: Fixed lump sum for all employees.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do I gather that the consensus is Yes on this?



25X1A9A

[ ] Yes.

MR. HELMS: Oh, definitely.

MR. WARNER: We would like a little more definitive answer of how much.

The military is six months. We waived a little bit and thought maybe our justification wasn't as good as military.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are just as dead.

25X1A9A

[ ] Yes, but the question raised is the rank. The cost is just as much usually in the case of a second lieutenant as it is in the case of a general officer. Some kind of a lump sum seems to be more desirable. Let me ask the question: When an employee dies overseas with dependents, does not the Agency bring back the body and the house effects?

MR. HOUSTON: Yes.

25X1A9A

[ ] The military is to enable the family to make some temporary arrangements for living while all of these other things are being settled, which usually take six months to a year to straighten out all of the pay accounts.

MR. WARNER: I think it is a very good point, General. It still is true because there are still the death benefits payable under other provisions of law. The basic purpose of this was to do exactly that to tide the widow over until her retirement or pension came through.

MR. HOUSTON: I would suggest this be left and we might have a compromise such as "Under regulations established by the Director, not to exceed six months" or something like that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we put our recommendation to the Task Force in these lines: The general consensus of the Board is a lump sum payment not tied to salary is preferable if possible? Tab E.

COLONEL WHITE: Do we feel that way now, or I would frankly rather leave it for further study?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, that gives them both ways. They can go either way on that. Tab E is "to establish terms of reference for consideration of liberalization of retirement benefits." I think if we move fastest on this we better take the conclusions. The conclusions start out, and this is what the Task Force wants: "Should required age be lowered? If so,

with or without reduction of pay scale proportionate to years under specified age?" My reaction toward that is not to lower the required age.

COLONEL WHITE: As I read this, Kirk, it would look like in some of our people, for instance, who spend the major portion of their service overseas . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I was going to get to that, Red. What I was going to do would be to put a factor on overseas service reducing the retirement.

COLONEL WHITE: The Foreign Service, for instance, according to this retire at 50 whereas one of our people might undergo much the same or greater hardship and he would have to wait until 62.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me spell that out a bit and, Dick, this is mainly in your side, but it seems to me that covering several points here that we want one career service for the Agency. We don't want two, a DD/I Career Service and a DD/P Career Service. Some of the DD/I career men will probably never serve overseas, and if they do for very brief periods, but obviously it would be unfair to have a man who spends two-thirds of his life overseas have to serve the same length of time that a man serves sitting in Washington, I think. There is no question about that. If the man sitting in the DD/I side wants to serve overseas, we will give him an opportunity to do so, so it be a case of choice by the individual recognizing the different advantages.

I would then say on the DD/P side that you would have different categories for your hardship posts, that there would be certain hardship posts where two years service would give three years retirement benefit, and there might be another hardship post where the service would give 2-1/2 years retirement benefits, and you might have two or three categories as such and that way give the benefit and advantage for somebody for serving in the posts which are less desirable. Obviously  you probably would have to serve there three years to get two years retirement benefits, or something like that.

25X1A6A

25X1A9A

[ ] I thought you were not going to give people a choice as to whether or not they were going to take a hardship post?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you are going to run any type of service you simply aren't going to do it with a shotgun.

COLONEL BAIRD: This may be silly, but I would think 40% of the people that are serving in Washington -- I just say 40 as something out of the hat -- would give their eye teeth to serve overseas but can't.

MR. SHELTON: The percentage is bigger than that.

COLONEL BAIRD: I don't know whether we should take that into consideration or not and just say that it is tough you are in the Agency and that you aren't going to have a chance to serve overseas and you will have to wait until you are 62.

MR. HELMS: There is a lifetime in this. When it is set up it isn't a question of five years or six years. When somebody comes in at 23 and serves until he is 63 I think the law of averages would give him a chance to serve overseas if he wanted to do it.

COLONEL BAIRD: You think the DD/I people . . . as many as 50% can get overseas if they want to do it?

MR. SHELTON: I think this overseas business . . . I don't think it is as clear cut as presented.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think 50% of the DD/I side would love to serve overseas if they could choose their post.

25X1A9A GENERAL [ ] What is the philosophy back of it? Is it the incentive to get people to serve overseas and hurry back and open up a filling station, or is it the wear and tear on the individual?

MR. WARNER: Serving abroad entails certain inconveniences and also certain increased mortality rates, health conditions, etc., and there is the hope to get the older men out and new blood up. Those are some of the justifications advanced by State Department. Now actually gearing it to overseas service the way Kirk has already mentioned would be somewhat less liberal actually than Foreign Service.

- 22 -

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You know this business of 50% wanting to serve overseas, I think it is so much hokum. They would like to serve overseas under their own terms. They would like to serve a two-year term in a pleasant place like [REDACTED], or something like that, but how would they like to serve there and then serve in [REDACTED] in the next?

25X1A6A

25X1A6A

COLONEL BAIRD: Some of it is straight economics. They would like to go some place where they could make money. Serving overseas is a way of making a hell of a lot more than serving in Washington.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do you agree with that, Dick?

MR. HELMS: In some places. There are other places where they don't.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That is true.

As far as wear and tear goes, there is a consideration.

I have been abroad once for the Agency in [REDACTED], and I don't see the wear and tear.

25X1A6A

COLONEL BAIRD: I think further consideration ought to be given to that.

[REDACTED] What is the purpose of it? If you are talking about a career service based upon motivation and desire to serve, then I question even the desirability of anything but an upward mandatory retirement age and not a lower privileged one.

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: What, for example, is the ground on which the FBI gets to retire earlier?

MR. HOUSTON: The ground on that is they want the majority of their people to engage in investigative work, and it is limited technically to those engaged in investigative work to be young, active people, and they consider it necessary in the nature of the hazardous aspects of the investigative. That is why it was also given to the Board of Patrol and later to the guards and cooks in prisons. The last was highly controversial.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think you have a good split on this one.

MR. WARNER: We figured so.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other comments on conclusion one?

And conclusion two we covered that. "Should required deposits be decreased?"

You mean by that . . . ?

MR. WARNER: Six percent cut, yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The answer to that is no.

MR. HOUSTON: Very few categories aren't subject to retirement, and they are subject now to Social Security.

MR. SHELDON: It always struck me as we were being kidded with that. In most industrial organizations where you have the same general theory you have X percent deducted from your own payroll, and the company adds a similar percent out of their own pocket.

MR. HOUSTON: You are buying an annuity here which is in excess of the amount you pay in, so there is a contribution by the Government. Also does it draw interest?

Four percent interest.

25X1A9A

MR. HOUSTON: And you can contribute additional funds to it. Four percent interest.

Our insurance consultants said the other day that by no stretch of the imagination could any insurance company provide retirement, comparable retirement, for a ~~comparable~~ comparable contribution. I mean what you get out of the Civil Service retirement fund is infinitely more than you put into it. The Government doesn't specify how much it contributes, but it just appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars a year to it.

25X1A9A

MR. SHELDON: I have always been doubtful about that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any comment on Conclusion four? I think it is a very happy dream, but I have yet to see the Federal Government tie salaries or retirement to dollar shrinkage. You just can't do it.

MR. WARNER: The military does.

MR. HOUSTON: There was an increase in some categories in the last big --

COLONEL WHITE: Retired officers were specifically . . . for in the bill, and the major increases in the last one, the allowances, retired officers benefited not at all.

MR. HELMS: But you could never second guess this kind of thing anyway. The Congress is going to fiddle around with it for years.

[ ] The military is not an annuity; it is a gratuity, isn't it?

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: I think that principle ought to be accepted that we tie this to the Civil Service Retirement Act because if we don't tie it to that, we are not then tied into anything, and all the dough that has been put in becomes a matter of high controversy around here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then let's pass on from this tab because that seems to take care of most of that.

[ ] Item 6 is a little bit different from the other things we considered. The idea there was would we seek to get back a greater proportion of what we put in? I don't know, but John Warner probably remembers exactly the figure, the factor, which is applied. Legislative employees tried Congress to get their factor increased by one. That is a different thing from reducing retirement age or the other things that were mentioned, to increase the amount of return at the time of retirement.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would recommend that the Task Force look at that bearing in mind that if it is decided we need legislation, which portions of the legislation are most important to get, and that would be one I don't think we would want to fight much for. That is something where we would once again be distinguishing ourselves from the rest of the Government service.

MR. HOUSTON: On this one too we may well run into opposition from the Administrative Branch of the Government. In Truman's regime there was a solid opposition to any further encroachments under the retirement system.

Now whether that has changed, I don't know. We may run into it right in the Executive Branch.

MR. HELMS: I don't mean to drag this on, but in this particular part of the study the issue that we really have here is not so much whether you lower the age, whether you raise the age, just how you modify the different types of service, but in this there has to be some sort of arrangement whereby individuals will be leaving the service say from the age of 50 on because if all were to stay at that age, you couldn't possibly use them. I mean there just aren't the jobs for them that is all. I don't know precisely what the point of view ought to be on this. I don't like the phrase "selection out", but we might just as well face the fact that a lot of the overseas duty if it is done properly, and I am not defending anybody sitting on their tail [ ] etc., but in most posts if it is done properly, it is essentially a young man's business, or at least a middle-aged man's business, and there aren't a lot of people I know who get along in years and have much stomach for it. They don't want to stand on cold street corners and meet agents. Consequently, we just couldn't accommodate if everybody stayed in through all of this period from 50 to 62 -- we couldn't accommodate them -- and I don't know where they would work in the Agency. I was thinking of this thing, and really the basis of this is when they get to a certain point how can they get out with some decent benefits better than Civil Service gives them now? You really don't touch that in the Civil Service until you are 62 or have been in 30 years.

25X1A6A

[ ] The Foreign Service does because they have this provision.

25X1A9A

MR. WARNER: That is what I pointed out. That is one of the justifications for the Foreign Service, and it would seem again that our justification could be equated to the Foreign Service. I don't know.

MR. HELMS: It probably could.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's go on to F.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, that was left a little vague as to how this

Career Board felt about it. I gathered it was a mixed feeling.

11  
MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think (1) it is agreed it would be tied into the Civil Service Retirement System the way it is now. I think to try and break ourselves away from that is so administratively difficult that we shouldn't try it, and (2) that the problem there is a serious problem to consider about retirements at an earlier age than provided for there, particularly on the DD/P side of the house, but it would have to be across the board. Let's not delineate between the type so low you might equate that to Foreign Service. Does anybody wish to add to that? (No comments)

12  
Tab F -- "Appropriate and Adequate Leave System." I think the whole of this could be summed up that home leave be made similar to the Foreign Service proposition. Is there any dissension from that? (None)

Tab G -- "Educational Allowances to Employees Serving Overseas."

[ ] Very unfortunate indeed this is.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it is almost unanimous that this is extremely important to accomplish.

25X1A9A

[ ] Mr. Chairman, I raise the point there that the discussion during the Task Force meetings brought out difficult decision in

25X1  
[ ]  
and as I recall it -- John, I don't remember the present situation, conclusion -- we were still in doubt as to whether the thing that was planned for the overseas people could also be extended to hardship cases in

13  
25X1  
[ ] I raised the point because I think it is tied in with that question of medical benefits. As I recall, the Board felt that some provisions should be made for medical benefits in . . . or rather the law should be so phrased that difficult situations [ ]

25X1

25X1  
[ ] could be bettered, and the question is: Does the same thing apply to the educational circumstances? I don't know what the . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It has to be in consonance with the rest of the Government, and I think if the Task Force wants to look at that particular



25X1A6A

13 problem to see whether our people in [redacted] or wherever it may be, are going to need assistance with the instruction that we knock that out in line with the rest of the Government because I don't think we will ever get anything through of that nature. We have military services serving there, and the FBI, and there is one area where we can't claim a legitimate distinction of work.

Tab I am I correct? There is no Tab F. H

25X1A9A

[redacted] That is right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Pay scales. There seem to be two alternatives as I see it. I think we can skip <sup>para</sup> C and adopt a procedure which ties pay scales to the cost of living index. Congress will never buy that. I don't think we want to assimilate military grades. It would be my recommendation that we stay on the GS scale.

14 MR. HELMS: I agree. I think the less we monkey around with that sort of stuff the better off we are. I understand that is one of the most controversial things in Government.

MR. HOUSTON: If we bring it up we may get ourselves in a jam. We have quite a bit of flexibility now, and I think we ought to work out our problems in the frame of what we can do now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, the recommendation on Tab I is to forget it. The classification, I think that is something that can be worked out administratively. I am not convinced legislation is needed for classification. If we can adopt the lame duck, or black duck, or whatever it is that has been flying around here, why, that can be done administratively, can't it, Red?

COLONEL WHITE: No, I don't think we need legislation, do we, Larry?

MR. HOUSTON: No, the policy problem is to administration but not legislatively.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tab <sup>I</sup> the conclusion is present legislative authority is adequate.

Tab L is the Personnel Evaluation System, the nugget to which is we seem to be a little illegal at the moment.

MR. HOUSTON: With the full knowledge of the Civil Service Commission and their support to eliminate the application of the Act when we can.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, we should put this in if we can?

MR. HOUSTON: Or if we have any other excuse to get any legislation, we can probably throw this in. It is probably not controversial.

15 [ ] There is one other angle here, and that is the possible illegality of in-grade step increases by reason of the fact that we don't have a rating system. Therefore, it is really quite important to get exception.

MR. HOUSTON: Yes, no one has taken the point up officially yet, and we feel somebody is aware of it, but it could hit us all of a sudden.

COLONEL WHITE: But doesn't the Director's authority to fix salaries give us a pretty strong position?

MR. HOUSTON: It is just not clear, and we could get in trouble, so we ought to get out of it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tab M -- "Hardship Posts."

25X1A9A [ ] Your problem here is we have people on a number of places where State doesn't have people, and you can't uniformly follow the State . . . We are into that problem [ ] for example, [ ] where all we can get is the [ ] allowance. Where State doesn't have one we establish our own.

MR. HOUSTON: We have done that in the past.

16 MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, John, the answer seems to be follow

[ ]

MR. HOUSTON: Based on the same standards. We have done that previously.

[ ] That can be done administratively.

[ ] Any more comment on M? (No comment) Do we need

KIRKPATRICK:

25X1A9A

25X1A6A

25X1A6A

25X1A6A

25X1C4A

25X1A9A

legislation to tell people they are expected on duty 24 hours a day if necessary?

MR. HELMS: No.

MR. HOUSTON: No.

COLONEL WHITE: The question arises whether you do or not whether you get any overtime for it.

MR. HELMS: The communications people . . . every once in awhile don't you run into this?

25X1A9A

[ ] Yes, but my idea of this 24-hour duty is: (1) Are you injured in the line of duty? (2) An emergency. I expect anybody in my office to come down to the office if there is an emergency. But if you are going to have them down there working all day Saturday and Sunday to noon every day, then it is a question of overtime, and I think that can be handled administratively.

COLONEL WHITE: I do so too.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tab O -- "Tenure". This is a very important principle, actually. I differ from the Task Force here in that I don't think that we would like to get ourselves into having an outside board reviewing the Director's decision for tenure. It isn't consistent with an intelligence service.

[ ] Isn't it true that the policy ~~has been~~ heretofore and also the background of the legislation means that it is only under certain circumstances that the Director will use his power?

25X1A9A

MR. HOUSTON: It is primarily for the security or other purposes related to national interest, so we do not use it.

25X1A9A

[ ] So if we ever use a principle of selection out of a veteran, a veteran can appeal, so we are in the bind somewhere on this.

COLONEL BAIRD: Unless the Director chooses to modify his stand.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the Director can modify that stand, don't you, Larry? If we go for a new piece of legislation, it seems to me that is something to be clarified is the Director's right to terminate.

COLONEL WHITE: This may be controversial, but there is no question that the Director has the authority to do this, and I think that we have a far better chance of modifying our position internally if necessary than we have of getting any legislation.

MR. HOUSTON: I think selection out is rather a different problem from the ones we are faced with where somebody has goofed off and we don't want to keep him, but it is an administrative problem, and we don't want to use the Director's authority on that sort of thing, particularly when the fellow is a veteran, because then his use of the power will be attacked, and then maybe it will be taken from him, but selecting out is somewhat different from that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think this selecting out in itself is something the Task Force together with the administrative people better study and come up with some specific recommendation because we can talk about that from now until midnight.

18 COLONEL BAIRD: We have talked about it for five years, I guess, and never get anywhere. We still don't have the machinery set up to get rid of a guy we want to get rid of.

COLONEL WHITE: I don't agree with that. I have gotten rid of a lot of them, and it is the question of whether you have guts enough to sit across the table from the man and be honest with him and tell him he is not doing his job, and what he has to do in order to do it adequately, and then if he doesn't do it, if you make a record of it and do a second time we can get rid of him. We have done it. I have done it myself and done it time and time again.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree 100%.

MR. HOUSTON: The problem has been they want to fire him right after they have given him an excellent efficiency report.

COLONEL WHITE: The problem is we just don't have a job for him anymore. Where a supervisor on any level has the courage and the honesty to sit down with the man and be frank with him and document it we can get rid of him.

[ ] At noon today the Personnel Office received two cases of surplus personnel who had been on the surplus list for 120 days. The Personnel Office had not been able to place them anywhere in the Agency. The supervisor and the supervising deputy -- the area I am not identifying it -- says there are no charges they can prefer against either of these two men. Now here is the bind. How are we going to get them off when nobody is going to prefer charges and they are veterans?

25X1A9A

COLONEL WHITE: Is this the same problem Matt is talking about -- are no good?

25X1A9A

[ ] I don't know if they are no good, but the supervisor won't say they are no good because they have no specific charges to make, and you have to have specific charges if it is a veteran.

18 [ ] There are jobs in this outfit, Red, that the difference between doing a good job and a not quite good enough job are so subtle that it is just damn hard to tell a guy, "You do it different -- this way -- and do it, well, to my satisfaction." All right, he will come back, and he will say, "Well, I did what you told me to do," but you will still think it is not a quite good enough job. That is where you get into trouble.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is so much controversy on this particular subject. I have heard this fought over in the Agency to at least 150 man hours. If the Task Force will take this up with the administrative people and issue invitations to anybody that wants to come and participate in that particular operation.

COLONEL BAIRD: You will have another five years.

[ ] Are you going to extend our deadline?

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: O and P I think are very close to the same.

25X1A9A [ ] I would like to ask if the Task Force considered the legislation the military services have obtained to try and accomplish this same thing?

19 MR. WARNER: Yes.

25X1A9A

[ ] They have gotten themselves in a hell of a bind on this.

MR. HELMS: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You mean this career program in the military now?

25X1A9A

[ ] Yes. I am scared of legislation on the thing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your selection out process and limiting the number of grades General Cabell was worried about.

25X1A9A

[ ] You do have one provision. A regular can be required to show cause why he should not be separated, and you have a lot of folks come up, and the man is mediocre. The Selection Board then recommends his separation. He has no appeal, but it does go on up through the Review Board and finally to the Secretary of the service. That is the only successful way of getting out people that I have seen yet. They have to show cause why they should be retained, and it is up to them to show why. But I am scared of legislation on it.

COLONEL WHITE: Not only that, but we are liable to get into what some other government agencies have gotten into where you have the number of personnel officers, for instance, definitely fixed by law as to how many you can have, and it isn't very many.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can say that again. Is there any comment on P? I think we have covered that fairly well in our discussion above.

S is "Establishment of a Reserve." I think the principle here is very good.

MR. HELMS: It takes a hell of a lot of study this question in this Agency, but the security status of the people . . . how desirable is it to have people come floating in and floating out?

MR. HOUSTON: It is a terrible problem to run.

MR. WARNER: Dick, I don't think the inference is necessarily that you have to have people floating in and out. Actually in your Foreign Service, for example, their Reserve Program is simply based on the provision which says that there shall be a reserve under such regulations

as the Secretary may prescribe. It all stems from that, and it can be just as broad as you want it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can get that in the legislation, that there shall be a reserve under such provisions as the Director of Central Intelligence shall prescribe.

MR. WARNER: We are supposed to get some guidance on a couple of those points.

COLONEL BAIRD: Maybe we are going too fast, Kirk.

20 MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we are going all right presumed this Task Force meets with the administrative officers and will meet with us, have some sort of an agenda, where others of us want to sit in on some of these more controversial problems such as reduction in force, which I think is the most controversial you have got, selection out, and as far as military reserve, that can tie you up for weeks.

MR. WARNER: Yes, it could. I don't know whether that is really a part of the Career Task Force, Kirk. I think it is a problem, of course, but should we consider it?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think so. Does anybody feel contrary on that? (No response) I think you better just disassociate yourself.

MR. WARNER: Thank you.

MR. KIRK: Are there any other comments on S? (No response) T?

25X1A9A

21  I don't think this is necessary at all in terms of legislation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is the general feeling on that?

COLONEL BAIRD: I suppose the philosophy behind it is that if you ask for benefits you have to spell out some of your obligations different from the Department of Agriculture.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe General Counsel has touched on that in some of his comments. Perhaps in your legislation it would be necessary to put in your philosophy of a career service under which you might embody some of these principles. Whether all of these principles are necessary, the four on the second page I thought were very sound.

25X1A9A

[ ] The meat of the thing is right in the middle of the page "2. Establishing by statute that a Careerist cannot resign except for good cause established to the satisfaction of the DCI or his designee." If I came in and knew I couldn't resign unless I put up one hell of a good case, then I want the same as military retirement -- three-fourths of my base pay after 30 years.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is that true in Foreign Service, they can't resign?

MR. WARNER: No, it has been established in a sense in the Foreign Service when you get appointed a Foreign Service Officer the usual thought is you are going to stay there, but it is not any legislative provision to my knowledge on the subject.

25X1A9A

[ ] No, but we are resigning them every day, and they are resigning so they can go to another station [ ]

25X1C4A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me most of these items 1 through 6 on the first page of Tab T are matters that can be taken care of internally under regulations.

MR. WARNER: We threw them in here because they are actually present

25X1C4A

[ ]  
MR. HELMS: Let's get all of our quids straightened out before we worry too much about the quos.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me thinking ahead the way it would be after we decide what we want, then we decide what we commit ourselves to in order to get that. Anything else on Tab T?

[ ] I was going to ask for an opinion on 1, 2, 3, 4 on the next page.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

[ ] Well, it certainly would ease my daily work if one was required, but it shouldn't be required unless you have the compensating factors. An employee says he will go anywhere you want him to . . .

MR. SHELDON: I don't see how you are going to give them anything that is going to counterbalance these requirements.



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes on one, no on two, yes on three.

MR. HOUSTON: Four, Kirk, I would suggest is too broad as phrased, but it might be acceptable if you say "to CIA conditions of employment including authorized security regulations relating to intelligence sources and methods."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But I think they all need further examination.

MR. WARNER: Well, of course, they do, but do we like the idea or don't

we?

25X1A9A

[ ] I think we would need legislation.

MR. HOUSTON: I am not sure that legislation really adds much to . . .

MR. HELMS: I don't see how it does. I will be damned if I do.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the only way you can put it in legislation frankly is if the Congress insists upon it.

25X1A9A

MR. HOUSTON: Still you are not going to send a man out to run a station when he is kicking like a steer and crying.

21 [ ] You do in the military or court martial him.

25X1A9A

[ ] In the Foreign Service he resigns, or has to resign, or rather he is thrown out of the Foreign Service if he declines three posts.

COLONEL BAIRD: One makes no sense unless two is in there. A man can sign anything that he wants to in January, '53, and change his mind in June, and you have no control over him.

MR. HELMS: There is nothing about American citizenship that allows you to tie anybody up with any piece of paper.

COLONEL BAIRD: It is just on the honor system.

25X1A9A

[ ] It seems to me you have got this kind of thing if you got good people and you don't have to worry about it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is very easy to say, [ ] but quite different to do.

25X1

[ ] I know, sure it is difficult. I am not saying it isn't, but I just don't feel . . . about the thought of building a cage

25X1A9A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

here with a lot of bait in it that we are going to manage to keep good people. I just don't believe it.

COLONEL BAIRD: We ~~can~~ make the Junior Officer Trainees sign such a statement, but if they resign, why, there is nothing we can do about it except slap their wrists, and we don't even do that.

25X1A9A

21 [ ] That is true also of external training, isn't it also, Matt?

COLONEL BAIRD: No, they make a statement merely that they intend to make CIA a career, but we don't specify for what length of time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, an awful lot of that could be done administratively; it doesn't have to be done legislatively. Are there any other comments on T? (No comments)

U -- "Relief for Personal Hardship."

MR. HOUSTON: Should we put that aside until we see how our other plans are working out, Kirk?

22 MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me that d., Larry, is the answer to this, and that is what we are examining right now is an aid society or a hardship foundation.

MR. HOUSTON: I have never heard of anyone else who has been able to get real hardship authority, and I don't see where we are so radically different that we would be able to persuade them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would take a Solomon that would be able to write the legislation to cover . . .

MR. HOUSTON: Or just give a blank check.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And W, according to Mr. [ ] is where they want the most guidance.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A [ ] Here I say you certainly tie yourself the very least. There are three deputies, some this or that, or Inspector General, or isn't one . . . ?

23 MR. HELMS: That is murder.

25X1A9A [ ] It is just like the inside ants can only be

- 37 -

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

treated by the Quartermaster. You requisition clordane for them. For outside ants, they come from the Engineers.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: To go through these items starting with the item on discussion, I think we are generally agreed that if legislation is required, it should be specifically addressed to the CIA, and they should try and encompass in that one legislative package everything we need for a Career Service, that it is generally agreed there is one intelligence service in the Agency and are not two or several.

I think that certainly we should get into any act, that we put in any benefits that the Foreign Service has gotten in theirs which we can pick up and add to ours if we think we require them.   I think has already answered very adequately 3 and 4 for everybody and 5, 3 and 4 particularly. I don't think we want to bind ourselves any more than possible. The question is whether 5 or 6 require legislation. Have they not been accomplished administratively?

25X1A9A

23  
MR. HOUSTON: No.

COLONEL BAIRD: You can't do that administratively.

MR. HELMS: I would hate to get into a hassle about this military service issue. Holy Moses!

COLONEL WHITE: You just have an impossible problem with the military on that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then paragraph 7. I think the answer to that is that if legislation is going to require inspection by extra-Agency bodies, the answer is the legislation isn't what we want and that we must maintain our complete independence from anybody looking at us except the President and whatever the Congress might decide to look at us.

MR. HOUSTON: I concur.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That does it. The meeting is adjourned.

... The meeting then adjourned at 1740 ...

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~